

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/483,854	(01/17/2000	Randy L. Knust	13169	8936
38055	7590	03/05/2004		EXAMINER	
TIM COOI	K		ASHBURN, STEVEN L		
P.O. BOX 1	0107		*		
LIBERTY, TX 77575				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3714	22.
				DATE MAIL ED: 02/05/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. •	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/483,854	KNUST ET AL.
•	Examiner	Art Unit
	Steven Ashburn	3714 ·
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 20 December 2003 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av- inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I: ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension
ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officemely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CM.	the shortened statutory period for reply one later than three months after the mail FR 1.704(b).	originally set in the final Office action; or ling date of the final rejection, even if
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	·	see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	`	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· · · · ———	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		•
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	⊠ will be entered and an wor appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>4-9 and 17-20</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		2
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	— W//_
0. Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		XV
		MARK SAGER PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the Schubert does not teach cameras behind an arcuate wall adjacent to wagering locations. The examiner respectfully disagrees. See office action dated Dec. 17, 2003, p. 2. Schubert states, "Additionally, video cameras can be disposed within a raised rail or ridge that may be disposed around the perimeter 16, for example". Reference 16 refers to the arcuate table edge illustrated in figure 1.

Continuation of 10. Other: The amended claims do not overcome the prior art. See office action dated Dec. 17, 2003. In particular, Fishbine discloses chip recognition by HIS and particle analysis correlation. See col. 3:66-4:43.